

SULLIVAN REPLIES TO HEARST.

HEARST'S REJOINER CREATES A SCENE IN THE HOUSE.

He Says When He Was a Student at Harvard a Man Was Threatened to Death in a Saloon Kept by One John A. Sullivan, Who Was Indicted for the Crime, and He Asks Representative Sullivan if He Knows Anything About That Incident.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 13.—This being Monday, was a busy day in the House of Representatives, and the largest lot of dirty linen that has been seen for a long time was displayed for the benefit of the members and the edification of the galleries. Personalities of the highest kind were indulged in by two Democratic members, and before they were through one had been accused of being a defaulter and the other of being a murderer. The parties to the controversy were Representative John A. Sullivan of Massachusetts and Representative William R. Hearst of New York, and the trouble between them arose from Mr. Sullivan's opposition to the Hearst plan for setting the railway rate question.

Mr. Sullivan had been attacked in the New York American, one of the newspapers which Mr. Hearst owns. In a Washington despatch to that newspaper reference was made to the alleged color of Mr. Sullivan's nose, and other uncomplimentary personalities were used. Mr. Sullivan, today, rising to a question of personal privilege, delivered a scathing attack on Mr. Hearst, whom he held responsible for the despatch. His speech was couched in vigorous language that showed Mr. Sullivan to be a pretty good swarmer of Philipp. He called Mr. Hearst "a swarmer of Philipp," and said his paper had a "political assassination department."

He spoke of the "contemptible and immoral equipment" of the man he was attacking, and of a candidate for the Presidency, obviously meaning Mr. Hearst, whose campaign had begun in a debauch and ended in a fiasco, the main features of which were the grossest form of corruption. There was an occasional derision while Mr. Sullivan was speaking. The point of Mr. Sullivan's language, Mr. Sullivan's language, but Speaker Cannon ruled that there was nothing unparliamentary in what the Massachusetts man said, and at times there was much confusion on the floor.

The response of Mr. Hearst was brief. He assumed responsibility for the despatch to which Mr. Sullivan objected, but said he did not inspire it. Then he charged that Mr. Sullivan had been one of two men who kicked a drunken man to death in a low dive in Cambridge, Mass., and asked Mr. Sullivan to explain. His face livid, Mr. Sullivan rose to respond, but Representative Butler of Pennsylvania, evidently laboring under great excitement, demanded that "this thing be stopped."

Speaker Cannon held that Mr. Hearst was proceeding within his rights, and Mr. Sullivan was on the point of replying when he was persuaded by some of his friends to drop the controversy for the time being. He will have another say to-morrow, when it is expected that there will be exciting scenes. After the episode, Mr. Sullivan explained that he and his father were the persons to whom Mr. Hearst referred in the reference to a murder at Cambridge. Mr. Sullivan said he was then a boy, and his father was charged with having killed a man, and he was fined and his father sent to prison. Later, he said, it was shown that the man died from the effects of alcohol and his father was pardoned.

As soon as the incident of yesterday's proceedings of the House had been read, Mr. Sullivan rose to a question of personal privilege. At the suggestion of Speaker Cannon Mr. Sullivan asked permission to make a personal explanation. This was granted and he proceeded. Mr. Sullivan referred to a colloquy between himself and Mr. Hearst in the New York American, in which he (Mr. Sullivan) was called a "bait," and asked Mr. Hearst to explain. He said he hoped the gentleman from New York (Hearst) would have the decency to reply to the statement from his place on the floor. Mr. Robinson (Dem., Ind.), amid jeers and derogatory remarks, made the point that Sullivan could not infer the motives of a fellow member, nor inform him, under parliamentary law, in terms of opprobrium or abuse.

Butting upon this point, Speaker Cannon said that Sullivan evidently was not discussing any member of the House, but a newspaper man. He said that Mr. Sullivan was described as a profanation of the raising of the eyes of one suffering from "congenital incapacity" to the fairest prize in the Temple of Freedom, the Presidency. Mr. Robinson again made the point of order that Sullivan was transgressing parliamentary privilege. Speaker Cannon examined the words complained of and found no ground for members on the floor, and ruled that upon the record this presented he could not say Sullivan was out of order. Mr. Sullivan denied the charge that he was ignorant of what had been done in the way of railway legislation, and he compared his record in the House with that of Mr. Hearst, who, he said, had answered to only nine out of fifty-five roll calls since he became a member.

"His constituents," he added, "evidently do not expect him to come here often, for by neglecting him they endorsed his record of absence." Later, when Mr. Sullivan said that he could not harm him by his absence from the House than by his presence therein. "Many members of this House," Mr. Sullivan said, "must feel some curiosity to know why the gentleman from New York ever breaks his custom by coming into the House at all. He comes here solely because of his position here an opportunity to exploit his candidacy for the Presidency of the United States. That he is a candidate for the Presidency is a truth that has been too startling, for after the country took a survey of him it discounted him as a possibility and has looked forward with relief to the day when he will be sent to the Democratic party had once nominated an editor, but he failed to remember that it had nominated a member of Congress. The political parties of this country frequently nominate great men; almost always good men; but always men who have shown ability in some branch of the public service. They have never nominated an unknown man or a political novice whose only recommendation is his inherited wealth."

"But, fortunately for his party, and more fortunately for the country, the candidacy of the gentleman from New York began in a debauch and ended in fiasco. While it lasted a campaign of corruption was waged that has no parallel in American history. It is true that the honest men supported him who did not know him well, but it is also true that the main feature of that campaign was the use of the grossest form of corruption that ever shocked the conscience of the American Commonwealth. Perhaps the reason of that failure has been revealed by the gentleman from New York, and I trust that it has."

"I know, Mr. Speaker, that prudential reasons warn against a controversy with a newspaper of this character. Those reasons present the danger of exposure to a new form of 'yellow peril,' as disastrous to reputation as the other form is alleged to be to Christian civilization. But, while I remain a member of this House, I will reply to unjust attacks in the newspapers of the gentleman from New York by sending to the clerk's desk, to be read with the article complained of, an estimate of

the character of my adversary, which was given upon the floor of this House by a member from California in 1897, as the judgment of those with whom the gentleman from New York then lived, and who, for that reason, knew him best.

At the conclusion of Mr. Sullivan's remarks, which were received by the members with laughter and applause, Mr. Hearst was recognized to request that he be permitted to reply to Sullivan, and unanimous consent was granted. He spoke calmly, without excitement, almost impassively, standing with his hands in his breeches pockets, whence they were removed only to arrange his notes or to raise a glass of water to his lips, the only manifestation of nervousness on his part. He said that the gentleman from Massachusetts had greatly overestimated the force and effect of the article that had appeared in his paper. It had been printed without his connivance or consent, but he assumed all responsibility for it, as he did, he said, for everything that appeared in any of his papers. He imagined that Sullivan's complaint had grown out of the fact that the article mentioned the name of John A. Sullivan, who had been indicted for the crime, and before they were through one had been accused of being a defaulter and the other of being a murderer. The parties to the controversy were Representative John A. Sullivan of Massachusetts and Representative William R. Hearst of New York, and the trouble between them arose from Mr. Sullivan's opposition to the Hearst plan for setting the railway rate question.

Mr. Sullivan had been attacked in the New York American, one of the newspapers which Mr. Hearst owns. In a Washington despatch to that newspaper reference was made to the alleged color of Mr. Sullivan's nose, and other uncomplimentary personalities were used. Mr. Sullivan, today, rising to a question of personal privilege, delivered a scathing attack on Mr. Hearst, whom he held responsible for the despatch. His speech was couched in vigorous language that showed Mr. Sullivan to be a pretty good swarmer of Philipp. He called Mr. Hearst "a swarmer of Philipp," and said his paper had a "political assassination department."

He spoke of the "contemptible and immoral equipment" of the man he was attacking, and of a candidate for the Presidency, obviously meaning Mr. Hearst, whose campaign had begun in a debauch and ended in a fiasco, the main features of which were the grossest form of corruption. There was an occasional derision while Mr. Sullivan was speaking. The point of Mr. Sullivan's language, Mr. Sullivan's language, but Speaker Cannon ruled that there was nothing unparliamentary in what the Massachusetts man said, and at times there was much confusion on the floor.

The response of Mr. Hearst was brief. He assumed responsibility for the despatch to which Mr. Sullivan objected, but said he did not inspire it. Then he charged that Mr. Sullivan had been one of two men who kicked a drunken man to death in a low dive in Cambridge, Mass., and asked Mr. Sullivan to explain. His face livid, Mr. Sullivan rose to respond, but Representative Butler of Pennsylvania, evidently laboring under great excitement, demanded that "this thing be stopped."

Speaker Cannon held that Mr. Hearst was proceeding within his rights, and Mr. Sullivan was on the point of replying when he was persuaded by some of his friends to drop the controversy for the time being. He will have another say to-morrow, when it is expected that there will be exciting scenes. After the episode, Mr. Sullivan explained that he and his father were the persons to whom Mr. Hearst referred in the reference to a murder at Cambridge. Mr. Sullivan said he was then a boy, and his father was charged with having killed a man, and he was fined and his father sent to prison. Later, he said, it was shown that the man died from the effects of alcohol and his father was pardoned.

As soon as the incident of yesterday's proceedings of the House had been read, Mr. Sullivan rose to a question of personal privilege. At the suggestion of Speaker Cannon Mr. Sullivan asked permission to make a personal explanation. This was granted and he proceeded. Mr. Sullivan referred to a colloquy between himself and Mr. Hearst in the New York American, in which he (Mr. Sullivan) was called a "bait," and asked Mr. Hearst to explain. He said he hoped the gentleman from New York (Hearst) would have the decency to reply to the statement from his place on the floor. Mr. Robinson (Dem., Ind.), amid jeers and derogatory remarks, made the point that Sullivan could not infer the motives of a fellow member, nor inform him, under parliamentary law, in terms of opprobrium or abuse.

Butting upon this point, Speaker Cannon said that Sullivan evidently was not discussing any member of the House, but a newspaper man. He said that Mr. Sullivan was described as a profanation of the raising of the eyes of one suffering from "congenital incapacity" to the fairest prize in the Temple of Freedom, the Presidency. Mr. Robinson again made the point of order that Sullivan was transgressing parliamentary privilege. Speaker Cannon examined the words complained of and found no ground for members on the floor, and ruled that upon the record this presented he could not say Sullivan was out of order. Mr. Sullivan denied the charge that he was ignorant of what had been done in the way of railway legislation, and he compared his record in the House with that of Mr. Hearst, who, he said, had answered to only nine out of fifty-five roll calls since he became a member.

"His constituents," he added, "evidently do not expect him to come here often, for by neglecting him they endorsed his record of absence." Later, when Mr. Sullivan said that he could not harm him by his absence from the House than by his presence therein. "Many members of this House," Mr. Sullivan said, "must feel some curiosity to know why the gentleman from New York ever breaks his custom by coming into the House at all. He comes here solely because of his position here an opportunity to exploit his candidacy for the Presidency of the United States. That he is a candidate for the Presidency is a truth that has been too startling, for after the country took a survey of him it discounted him as a possibility and has looked forward with relief to the day when he will be sent to the Democratic party had once nominated an editor, but he failed to remember that it had nominated a member of Congress. The political parties of this country frequently nominate great men; almost always good men; but always men who have shown ability in some branch of the public service. They have never nominated an unknown man or a political novice whose only recommendation is his inherited wealth."

"But, fortunately for his party, and more fortunately for the country, the candidacy of the gentleman from New York began in a debauch and ended in fiasco. While it lasted a campaign of corruption was waged that has no parallel in American history. It is true that the honest men supported him who did not know him well, but it is also true that the main feature of that campaign was the use of the grossest form of corruption that ever shocked the conscience of the American Commonwealth. Perhaps the reason of that failure has been revealed by the gentleman from New York, and I trust that it has."

"I know, Mr. Speaker, that prudential reasons warn against a controversy with a newspaper of this character. Those reasons present the danger of exposure to a new form of 'yellow peril,' as disastrous to reputation as the other form is alleged to be to Christian civilization. But, while I remain a member of this House, I will reply to unjust attacks in the newspapers of the gentleman from New York by sending to the clerk's desk, to be read with the article complained of, an estimate of

Unparalleled Achievement!
Importations in 1904 of
G. H. MUMM & Co.'s
CHAMPAGNE
131,330 CASES
The GREATEST quantity ever imported by any brand in the history of the Champagne trade.
Regarding Champagne Importations in 1904, Bonifort's Wine and Spirit Circular of Jan. 10, 1905, says:
"Messrs. Fredk. de Bary & Co. brought over last year to this side of the water a greater number of cases of Champagne than has ever hitherto been known, and these importations speak in the strongest terms of the great popular esteem in which G. H. MUMM & Co.'s Champagne is held on this continent."

CRIPPLED WOMAN MURDERED.

BODY FOUND BURIED IN A STABLE'S MANURE HEAP.

Victim Was Deformed, Was Only 4 Feet Tall and Weighed Less Than Ninety Pounds—No Clue to Her Identity—Body Hidden in Inaccessible Place.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 13.—El Davis, a negro, who helps in the Union Transfer Company's stables at Cherry and Juniper streets, was leading up a wagon with manure from the shed this morning when his pitchfork struck something hard. At the same time Charles Gorman, the stableman, who was helping him, saw a pair of woman's feet, in buttoned leather shoes, sticking out of the pile.

Each took a pitchfork away and in doing so uncovered a woman's face. He threw down the pitchfork with a shriek and sped out the door and down the street. A policeman caught him and led him back. Then Davis, the policeman and Gorman uncovered the rest of the body.

The woman was about 35 years old, undersized, and a cripple. Her spine was badly deformed and she was pigeon-breasted. She was only four feet tall and weighed less than ninety pounds. There was a bruise over the right eye, and the body had been stiff and cold for hours. After the coroner had looked it over the body was sent to the morgue.

At first the police were inclined to the theory of accident, but later in the day they changed their mind and started out on the murder idea. There is absolutely not the slightest clue to the woman's identity. She is entirely unknown in the Tenderloin, from which it was at first thought she hailed.

The manure shed has a single door in the rear of the stable opening on "Clarion street," a little dark alley just below Cherry. The shed is about fifteen feet square, and the manure is shoveled from the stalls above through a chute. The door on Clarion street is of heavy wood, and the base of it is four feet above the ground, with no steps leading to it. The detectives concede that the woman could not have entered the pit unaided.

Besides this, her hair, torn and battered, and with clumps of hair caught in the pins was found in the street outside the stable. The last person to enter the pit prior to the finding of the body was William Stover, a stableman, who on Sunday afternoon smoothed the surface of the manure to accommodate the large quantity which is dumped there every Monday morning. When Stover left the pit the refuse was three feet deep, its surface being on a level with the door. No one else entered the place until this morning.

Last night about two tons more of refuse had been dumped in. The detectives say they are looking for two men and another woman, but they won't say what they have discovered to make them want the trio.

HOT FIGHT; BOTH DOGS KILLED.

Police Had to Shoot Them to Put Them Out of Misery.

Two bull terriers got into a fierce fight in Henry Weesman's grocery store, at Green and Liberty streets, Newark, yesterday afternoon. They drove out the customers and sent Mrs. Weesman into a dead faint. The police reserves had to be called out to disperse the crowd which gathered in front of the store.

One of the dogs was Weesman's Rex, a winner of prizes in two or three Jersey dog shows. The other was owned by Simon Markoff of 38 Liberty street. The Markoff dog had been penned up for ten days and was very hungry. As soon as he got his freedom he went around looking for Rex, apparently. He found him in the store and after a little preliminary growling took a hard hold on Rex's neck. There was a rush of customers for the door, and when Weesman arrived from the back of the store he found his wife had swooned.

Show cases, boxes of prepared food, baskets, apples, cans of corn, peas and so on were strewn about, for the dogs had a clear field so far as human interference was concerned. Weesman armed himself with a cleaver. The dogs, though still fighting, tried to keep out of his way, but he followed them until he could get in a good stroke. His first blow stopped the fight, for it took several inches of the fleshy part of the Markoff dog's back. The animal dropped to the floor, and Weesman kicked him out into the street. The police then arrived. They examined Rex and found him so badly lacerated that they shot him on the spot. Then they went hunting for the Markoff dog. They found him under the Markoff house, and it took three bullets to put him out of misery.

NOT CRAZY, BUT A CANDIDATE.

Case of the Young Man Who Sought Eggs at a Fifth Avenue Florist's.

A youth with an artificial blue carnation in the back of his hat walked into the store of a Fifth Avenue florist the other day. He was unusual enough in appearance to excite astonishment. His question surprised the salesman still more.

"Have you any eggs?" he asked. "Eggs?" the florist repeated with emphasis, "and I want you to remember that I said eggs." Then he walked out of the store. As he walked up the block the artificial flower in his hat attracted the attention of pedestrians, and a small group gathered about him when he sat down dejectedly on a stoop.

Presently there came into the flower shop two more young men, eager and bright. "Did a fellow come in here and ask for eggs?" one of them inquired. "And what because of it?" the other asked. "I said eggs," he repeated with emphasis, "and I want you to remember that I said eggs." Then he walked out of the store. As he walked up the block the artificial flower in his hat attracted the attention of pedestrians, and a small group gathered about him when he sat down dejectedly on a stoop.

The Liver Is Seldom Healthy
While Coffee Is the Daily Drink
DOCTORS RECOMMEND
POSTUM
There's a reason.

WOMAN AND NEGRO TO HANG.

MRS. EDWARDS'S CONFESSION DOES NOT SAVE THEM.

Pennsylvania's Supreme Court, by 4 to 3. Refuses to Grant a New Trial to Gresson, the Woman's Paramour—Mrs. Edwards's Child Taken Away.

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 13.—Despite the confession of Mrs. Kate Edwards of Reading, in which she assumes the entire responsibility for the murder of her husband and implicates her daughter Mary to save her negro paramour, Samuel Gresson, the Supreme Court, sitting in this city today, handed down a decision refusing the petition of Gresson for a new trial. Gresson and Mrs. Edwards were found guilty of the murder and are under sentence to be hanged on Thursday next.

The court refused the petition by a vote of 4 to 3. Justices Fell, Brown and Mestrezet dissenting. While the Judges were considering the confession of Mrs. Edwards, Alma, the prisonborn child of the condemned woman, was passing through Philadelphia to Washington in charge of two Sisters of Charity. The two were bound, it was asserted, to Tuskegee, to Booker T. Washington's school. There is no confirmation, however, that Mr. Washington has agreed to care for the little one.

It is practically certain that, despite the thousands upon thousands of petitions, no "Manias" will be given to Mrs. Edwards. Gresson's lawyers will take his case before the Pardon Board on Wednesday. It was because they knew this that the prison authorities of Reading decided to take Alma from her. It was the expected birth of this child that, according to the woman's confession, caused the murder of Edwards.

Mrs. Edwards had been in intimate terms with Gresson, and fearing that the color of the child might reveal her secret she killed her husband. READING, Pa., Feb. 13.—The news that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in Philadelphia by a vote of four Judges to three had refused to reopen the Edwards-Gresson murder case was received here late today and the officials decided to make preparations for the hanging of Mrs. Kate Edwards and Samuel Gresson on Thursday, there being little hope placed in the Board of Pardons, which meets at Harrisburg on Wednesday.

Early this morning there was a pathetic scene in the jail when Mrs. Edwards had to give up little Alma, her four-year-old mulatto daughter, probably forever. The prisonborn child was taken away by one of the women of the death watch. Mrs. Edwards moaned and wept, and in her agony wailed out that everything had now been taken from her, all her children, and soon her life would be taken. The child also wept.

The child was driven to the Pennsylvania Railroad station, where a Sister of Charity took charge of her and proceeded south, where Alma Edwards's identity will be forever lost. After the little one had left the prison Mrs. Edwards fell prostrate on her cot and sobbed loudly, and the prisoners near by wept freely, as the child had been the pet of the jail.

Gresson was informed late this afternoon that his petition for a new trial on the strength of the sworn confession of Mrs. Kate Edwards that she alone committed the deed had been refused by the Supreme Court. He drew himself up to full length and said he thanked heaven that God had placed it in the minds of three Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justices to be in favor of him, and he would pray fervently that the fourth Judge might think differently between now and Wednesday, so that the Board of Pardons might be inclined to view his case on the side of justice. He said Kate Edwards had now sworn to the truth. Gresson's lawyer, William Sadler, still has hopes that the favorable opinion of three Pennsylvania Supreme Court Judges will have weight with the Board of Pardons on Wednesday.

Mrs. Edwards has not yet been told of the Supreme Court decision against Gresson, as she is yet in a most deplorable state of mind caused by the taking away of her child. Her sorrowful confession was given to the public here for the first time this afternoon. The words are: "On the evening of July 3, 1901, her husband came home under the influence of liquor and was in bad humor, that after the rest of the family had supper he tapped the keg of beer, which had arrived that day, and which deponent had ordered at direction. All members of the family drank of the beer, and her husband became intoxicated and lay down on the porch in a drunken sleep, when deponent and her five children went to bed, about 9 o'clock.

"The four younger children went to sleep, and she and her daughter Mary then went downstairs, when Mary stood on the side of the house around the corner where the cistern was located, and deponent struck John Edwards several times on the head with his long handled hammer; that said John Edwards raised himself to a sitting posture and then rolled into the yard in front of the porch, where deponent again struck him with the hammer several times, and her daughter Mary then came around the corner from the side of the house, when deponent wrapped a piece of carpet around the head of John Edwards, and they, deponent and her daughter Mary, carried him along in front of the porch toward the end, where they crossed over the porch, and as deponent got on the stone steps, leading from the end of the porch down to the yard, said John Edwards slipped out of her grasp and he fell on the steps, which were the next day found marked with blood.

"She lifted him, again, carried him to the cistern and threw him in. Deponent and her daughter then washed the blood off of the porch, but missed washing several blood marks thereon; that though they washed the stone steps they missed washing the blood on the side of the steps. They also washed the ground in front of the porch where said John Edwards lay and when deponent struck him, the washing up of the blood was all done that night."

Mrs. Edwards says Gresson was not there that night and had nothing whatever to do with the tragedy; that she testified falsely against Gresson to convict him, in hope of securing the Commonwealth's influence to save herself from the scaffold. She says the lawyers and the court thought she was telling the truth when she swore Gresson helped to carry the body to the cistern, but it was untrue.

Mary Edwards, her daughter, still says Gresson was there that night. Feeling is running high in Reading to-night, as the news are very many who believe that Gresson was not there.

Informal Evening Clothes

For the man who gets about—socially, here's the right sort of a Dinner Coat to get about in—long, graceful, with athletic lines—our "Concave" Shoulder and "Coss-fitting" Collar.



Dinner Jackets of Flannel at \$12.50 and \$15.
Dinner Jackets of Whipcord at \$13.
Dinner Jackets of Undressed Worsted at \$20, \$25 and \$30.
Waistcoats and Trousers to match.

WM. VOGEL & SON,
Broadway, Houston St.

THE SELECT DISCUSS MANIAS.

UNMUZZLED TALK LET LOOSE AT THE SUNRISE CLUB.

Sadakichi Hartmann Philosophizes on Witchcraft in the Middle Ages—Emma Goldman Says We Still Have Hallucinations—One Nearly Finished Her.

Sadakichi Hartmann addressed the Sunrise Club last night upon the witchcraft mania of the Middle Ages. He was down for a defense of the witch burners. It was the regular bi-monthly dinner of the club.

"I begin with the understanding that none in this audience can be shocked," said Mr. Hartmann. Then he proceeded to try to explain the mania.

Here are a few of the most shocking passages, carefully expurgated. "Now the mania was the thing, the instincts were a characteristic of the Middle Ages. The children's crusade was a manifestation of this; so were the dancing mania and the strange sects which grew into devil worship."

"Witches in all countries had many things in common. There was the desire to fall into a cataleptic state, with strange visions, and the records of witchcraft phenomena in all countries read very much alike. From the forests they obtained the drugs which brought their strange visions, their belief in levitations, their hysteria. Women were particularly given to the habit. It grew with awful rapidity. No wonder that at times all Europe seemed to be sick."

"The authorities tried many means, and always came back to the same old cure. England had just such a problem to fight last night, the McKimley mania. Men and women were found who were ready to declare and to swear that in Denver, Cleveland, Chicago and St. Louis they had seen Coleridge and myself at the same time in the same place. So, you see, it isn't strange that people should suffer from hallucinations at any time. Suggestive of a great thing. Few ages have not been subject to its influence."

"Humanity hasn't changed much. They don't want to burn their witches in these days; they want to lynch them. When the McKimley mania was rife, I got 100 letters from respectable citizens telling me what they wanted me to do to get rid of it. I got out of jail. They were going to cut out my tongue, pour oil over me and set fire to me and cut me into bits. So, you see, once you get an idea started and get a few yellow journals to take it up, it spreads until the people believe it."

In rebuttal, Mr. Hartmann touched on his half Japanese ancestry, saying: "I only regret that my father hadn't been a negro and that I hadn't married an Indian. I could then abolish witching and Indianism by my reputation. The sympathy with witches is a Christian humanitarian ideal. Now there's only one sane and healthy doctrine of life—one laid down by Omar and some of the Chinese philosophers. Get out of life as much as you can, each for himself. That's the only road to happiness."

Shoe Scrapers for Subway.
From the New York Medical Journal.
One effect of the recent snowy weather with its disagreeable consequences under foot, can hardly be overestimated by those who are afflicted with an invariably clean and aseptic subway station. The ancient compound of partially melted snow, soot, horse manure, dog excrement, and the various filth which is the by-product of the subway, is a feature scarcely less objectionable than the advertisements and slot machines which disgrace the subway not only in foul weather, but at all times. It is not feasible to have something resembling the old fashioned iron shoe scraper at the head of each subway staircase to remove at least the heavier particles of septic matter?

ASPHALT GRAFT IN YONKERS?

Alderman Southwick Sues City Treasurer Shrive for Slander.

YONKERS, N. Y., Feb. 13.—Yonkers was stirred to-day by the announcement that a slander suit had been brought by Alderman John H. Southwick against City Treasurer William Shrive. The suit was based on a story told by Shrive to John W. O'Brien, editor of the Yonkers Statesman; Charles E. Hartshorn, Jr., receiver of taxes, and Christopher Stevens. It is asserted that Shrive charged Alderman Southwick with having demanded from C. O. Warren of the Warren Bros. Asphalt Company first \$3,000, then \$2,000 and finally \$1,000 for the company's bid in the fall of 1903 for the asphalt repaving of Yonkers.

The suit is the culmination of a struggle with the Republican ranks in that city. Between Southwick, the organization leader of the First ward, and Shrive, the organization leader in the Third ward, there has been a long and bitter feud. When Yonkers becomes a city of the second class, City Treasurer Shrive today made an attempt to get Shrive to resign. Shrive had told him, Shrive, at a sociable of the First Presbyterian Church last November that Southwick had offered to help the asphalt repaving of Yonkers, a considerable sum of money. Alderman Southwick declares that he made no proposition to Mr. Warren, and that he believes the accusation of Shrive is inspired by a desire to ruin him politically.

The Warren asphalt bid was accepted at a meeting of the Common Council on Wednesday, Nov. 11, 1903. Treasurer Shrive, then Alderman, moved that the Mayor and City Clerk be directed to enter into a contract with the Warren Asphalt Paving Company. On some question being raised as to whether it required eight affirmative votes to legally award a contract, Alderman Southwick changed his vote to the affirmative and the contract was awarded by the vote of 8 to 5, Southwick voting No.

C. O. Warren for years was connected with the Barber Asphalt Company. Then he became head of the Warren Company. His home has been on Warburton avenue, and he has been a resident of Yonkers for many years. Warren moved to Boston and his Warburton avenue home has been advertised for sale.

The case will come up before County Judge Platt. It is said the local leaders of Westchester county will be called as witnesses.

ONE VALENTINE FOR THE BUNCH

Of Ohio's Daughters—Also a Comeback After Forty Years.

One particular valentine excited the curiosity of all but two of the four hundred people at the Valentine convention given by the Daughters of Ohio in New York last night in the National Arts Club, 37 West Thirty-fourth street. It was written forty years ago by E. H. L. for E. H. C. and consisted of the favorite poem of school days in the country:

The rose is red,
The violet is blue,
Sugar is sweet,
And so are you.

It was the girl who produced it last night and the man who got it back. Those who were curious about it got a hint that the girl was one of the dignified vice-presidents. Each of the 200 Daughters had been requested to turn in two original valentines, and the verses were shuffled so that no poet need be compelled to read his own poetry aloud.

These lines were sent unsigned to the society in general. In fact all the valentines were signed by the Daughters of Ohio in New York last night in the National Arts Club, 37 West Thirty-fourth street. The reading of the valentines followed a musical programme, and then the guests, led by the officers, went into the grill room below for supper. The grill room was a tower of roses and smilax, brilliantly lighted with small incandescent lights, with the room festooned from every part of the room.

RUSH OF HOMESEKERS.

Crowds Assembling to Get Reservation Land in Western Nebraska.

NORTH PLATTE, Neb., Feb. 13.—Large crowds of homeseekers from Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa and Illinois have arrived here for the land opening under the provisions of the Kinkaid act to-morrow. The yearling homeseekers are expected to comprise 50,000 acres in western Nebraska, and it is in section lots of 640 acres each. The land originally was included in the acreage to be opened to settlement under the provisions of the Kinkaid act, but it was not until the last moment the Secretary of the Interior withdrew it from entry upon the theory that it could be irrigated. A big crowd of homeseekers, however, was to the effect that under the provisions of the Kinkaid act the land is regarded as good grazing land.

Some Quaint Colonial Things

Find faithful reproduction in a great number of pieces that we have modelled after the furniture of "Ye Olden Time." The "Independence" Table for the living room and study—the "Windsor" Chair, with its strong suggestion of deep-seated comfort—the "Heppelwhite" Cozy Sofa, with claw and ball feet—and the "Washington" Desks are mentioned as a few of the prominent pieces that are strongly reminiscent of our early Revolutionary history.

Grand Rapids Furniture Company

(Incorporated)
34th Street, West, Nos. 155-157
"MINUTE FROM BROADWAY."